

VIA E-FILE

PATENT APPLICATION
Docket No. 15689.89

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

TRANSMITTAL OF ISSUE FEE PAYMENT

Mail Stop Issue Fee
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Notice of Allowance and Issue Fee Due dated July 17, 2006, please find enclosed herewith the following items for filing in the United States Patent and Trademark Office in connection with the above identified patent application:

X Issue Fee Transmittal (PTOL-85B) submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.311.

X Payment using the Credit Card payment option in E-Filer with

RAM will be used to cover the following fees:

X The \$1,400.00 government issue fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.18.

X The \$300.00 government publication fee pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.18.(d)

X The Commission is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 23-3178.

Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance

On page 3 of the Examiner's Notice of Allowability, the Examiner has indicated that no prior art was found that "Claim 13 is the combination of previous independent claim 1 and objected claim 11. Thus claim 13 is allowable with the reason set forth in the previous office action. Claim 14-15 depend on claim 13. Thus, claims 14-15 are allowable. Claim 16 is the combination of previous independent claim 4 and objected claim 12. Thus, claim 16 is allowable with the reason set forth in the previous office action. Claim 17 depends on claim 16. Thus, claim 17 is allowable. Claim 18 is drawn to a system for implementing the method of claim 13. Thus claim, claim 18 is allowable with the same reason as that in claim 13. Claim 19 depends on claim 18. Thus, claim 19 is allowable."

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention as set forth in each of the independent claims and the dependent claims must be read as a whole, and not as a single feature or subcombination of features which represent less than the entirety of the claimed invention as a whole. While a particular feature or subcombination of features referred to by the Examiner in the Statement of Reasons for Allowance may represent a basis for distinguishing the claimed invention over the prior art, Applicants further submit that this may not necessarily be the *sole* ground for distinguishing the claimed invention over the prior art of record. Accordingly, the Examiner's statement should, in Applicants' view, not be read as constituting or meaning that the invention can or should be reduced to a single "feature" of the invention or to a subcombination of features that is less than the entire invention claimed as a whole, nor that the single feature referenced by the Examiner or subcombination of features referenced by the Examiner in the Statement of Reasons for Allowance is the only or sole grounds for distinguishing the invention over the prior art of record.

Please address all future correspondence in connection with the above-identified patent application to the attention of the undersigned.

Dated this 8th day of September, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

/ADRIAN J. LEE/

Adrian J. Lee
Registration No. 42,785
Attorney for Applicants
Customer No. 022913